DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 676 TM 860 737

AUTHOR Koppel, Sheree P.; And Others
TITLE Measuring School Improvement Implementation: Validation of the School Effectiveness Structural Components Inventory.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 68p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Attitudes; Elementary Education; Elementary Schools; *Improvement Programs; Institutional Characteristics; *Program Implementation; *Rating Scales; *School Effectiveness; *School Organization; Self Evaluation (Groups); Socioeconomic Status; Teacher Attitudes; Test Reliability; Test Reviews; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills; Effective Schools Research; Kentucky Essential Skills Test; *School Effectiveness; Structural Components Inven

ABSTRACT

The School Effectiveness Structural Components Inventory (SESCI) was designed to assess structural elements in a school environment that contribute to effectiveness. The preliminary validation took place in 12 elementary schools in or near a large metropolitan school district. The schools were classified by overall school socioeconomic status, as well as by achievement results in reading and mathematics on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills and the Kentucky Essential Skills Test. Third and fifth grade test scores were included in the analyses. SESCI was administered to teams of elementary school teachers and administrators; completion required about 2 hours. SESCI is a 7-point rating scale assessing 13 structural components of school improvement: mission and goals; staff development; inservice education; principal's role; program planning; curriculum, instruction, and testing alignment; instructional time; safe and orderly environment; evaluation methods; curriculum materials files; academic team games; rewards; and parent and community support. Test reliability was acceptable for six of the scales. Analyses revealed no significant correlations between the SESCI scales and socioeconomic status or achievement; thus SESCI did not do what it was intended to do. However, the instrument was useful for self-assessment purposes. Suggestions for further improvements were made. (GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278676

MEASURING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT IMPLEMENTATION: VALIDATION OF THE SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS INVENTORY

by

Sheree P. Koppel
Mercy Academy (Louisville)

Kathleen A. Sayre
Jefferson County (KY) Public Schools

Stephen K. Miller
Bruce T. Yelton
University of Louisville

Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, April 16-20, 1986

Draft: NOT to be quoted or reproduced without permission of the authors. Address correspondence below:

Stephen K. Miller
Assistant Professor
Foundations of Education
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40292
(502) 588-6475

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sheree P. Koppel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM860137

MEASURING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT IMPLEMENTATION: VALIDATION OF THE SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS INVENTORY[1, 2]

In their analysis of twelve case studies of innovation and school improvement, Huberman and Miles (1984), commenting on conditions related to lack of change, note that:

> . . . at four of the five sites where no durable organizational changes occurred, there were also no structural changes, even transitory ones, though there were sometimes transitory procedural and climate changes. Evidently, changing organizations means changing their structure. The fifth no-change site (____) had only one structural change (a new project director), which proved transitory. (p. 170)

This basic point has been too long ignored in education. The psychology of individual differences has dominated educational research and practice since the development of IQ and standardized tests (cf. Marks, 1980; Miller, 1985). Over the last two decades, with the development of teacher effectiveness research models, the focus has shifted somewhat (although certainly not completely) from individual student differences to differences in individual pedagogy (Shulman, 1986). While contextual variables are typically considered in this research, they are clearly background to the focus on the teacher's individual behavior and effectiveness.

Even the school effectiveness literature has been lacking in the study of structure. Considering that the fields of educational administration and organizational theory are strong contributors to

---

[1]This study was partially supported by a small grant from the University of Louisville School of Education Research and Faculty Development Committee.

[2]The assistance of Joseph M. Petrosko on data analysis and consultation is gratefully acknowledged.

the school effectiveness research, there has been surprisingly little effort to analyze structure; instead an overview of existing school effectiveness instruments suggests that some type of social or learning climate measure has been the basis of most research in this area (Guzzetti, 1985). To some extent structure has been tapped at the micro level in terms of various measures of time. Anderson (1981), for example, reviews a continuum ranging from allocated time to engaged time at success level. Structure is also a factor in the analysis of the use of testing from the level of the individual (diagnostic-prescriptive feedback) to the curriculum (instructional/testing alignment) to school assessment (analysis of school outcomes to guide program evaluation and planning). But such factors are seldom the focus of school effectiveness research and when included constitute a small proportion of the entire instrument.

Recent work indicates that this shortcoming has been recognized. Researchers studying school improvement, particularly in the fields of educational and organizational change, have long recognized the importance of structure. Sarason's (1971) classic work is devoted to the nature of informal behavioral (structural) regularities. Reviews that tie school improvement to school effectiveness take a sociological, structural approach (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984; Miller, Sayre, & Tinsley, 1984). Recent efforts to relate the degree to which social systems are loosely coupled (Weick, 1976) to school effectiveness (Rosenholtz, 1985) may provide a stronger theoretical framework for the field. Several researchers (reviewed below) have begun to measure coupling/linkages

in school effectiveness studies.

These recent efforts are sorely needed. Pink (1984) provides a stinging critique of the effective schools research: given the extent to which schools serve to reproduce the inequalities in the wider society through their functioning as selection and allocation agencies, the failure to analyze the effects of grouping and tracking in much of the effective schools research is not surprising. Perhaps this is an indication of how strong is the continuing sway on educational research of the dominant paradigm of individual differences (Miller & Brookover, 1986).

The research reported here is an effort to understand further the structural dimensions of school effectiveness. This paper reports preliminary validation data on the School Effectiveness Structural Components Inventory (SESCI) developed by Miller, Efthim, Koppel, and Sayre (1985). The inventory attempts to connect the measurement of structure to school effectiveness by building on the work of Brookover, Beamer, Efthim, Hathaway, Lezotte, Miller, Passalacqua, & Tornatzky (1982), who depict three conceptually distinct but mutually influencing realms in functioning school social systems: the ideology or social climate, organizational structure, and behavioral/instructional practices. Changes in any one area are intermeshed with changes in the other areas. This interweaving of climate, structure, and practices is paralleled by the influence of changes among the different role groups in the school, i.e., students, faculty, administration, and cliques within these groups. Huberman and Miles (1984), discussing relationships

among different sectors of the social system, note

> . . . that changes in everyday classroom practices probably precede cognitive and relational changes, which, in turn, build gradually into shifts in attitudes and in the more basic constructs that make up users' operational philosophies. (p. 157)

Echoing the earlier quotation from Huberman and Miles (1984), perhaps a prior question is whether changes in classroom practices are preceded by structural changes at different levels of school organizations, from the classroom to state and federal policies. This paper speaks to that issue.

Review of the Literature

Current trends indicate that considerable research focuses on the development of instruments and procedures that measure the extent to which schools possess characteristics associated with "effective schools." Rather than focusing on similar concerns, we chose to investigate an area not adequately covered by instruments already developed. It is the area of structure, as noted above, and structural components that seems to be least investigated by current instruments connected with school effectiveness.

The New Jersey questionnaire developed for use by an external group, the Johns Hopkins Effective Schools Battery, the Council on Basic Education Checklist, the Brookover et al. School Learning Climate Assessment Inventory, the Connecticut questionnaire, the interview developed by Villanova et al., and the Lezotte and Edmonds adaptation of the Connecticut questionnaire all include items dealing with structural components of effective schools; however, they fail to touch on the variety of important elements of structure necessary to assess fully the variable and/or they lack

specificity. As noted above, these instruments seem to deal most successfully with the ideology/climate cluster expressed in behavior and attitudes.

Some have used the Level of Use Interview developed by Hall, Loucks, Rutherford, and Newlove (1975) to measure the implementation of the effective schools program. Literature exists related to the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM), including Levels of Use of the Innovation (LoU), teacher stages of Concern about the Innovation, and Innovation Configurations. One of these areas, that of LoU, seemed a fruitful starting place as we began to explore possibilities for an instrument that would measure structural components.

Briefly, LoU is determined by personal interviews with those responsible for implementing an innovation or utilizing a change strategy. The interview format is generic, and the criteria for determining an individual's LoU are established and relatively simple to understand. Loucks, Newlove & Hall (1975), Hall & Loucks (1977), Hall, Loucks, Rutherford, and Newlove (1975), Hall (1974), and Loucks (1977), describe LoU in considerable detail, and these references may be consulted by those desiring a more detailed explication. For our purposes, however, we found LoU approaches lacking.

The LoU interview focuses on the individual, and there seems to be a necessary prior question that must be addressed before one examines to what extent individuals have become innovation users. Specifically, what are the structural factors associated with the

adoption of an innovation, and what do those factors look like when an effective schools model is being implemented? These questions must be answered, and the structural components measured, before data on individual teachers within an effective school project can be assessed meaningfully.

The literature on Innovation Configurations seemed to offer another avenue for exploration in thinking about structural components that must be in place if an effective schools innovation is to meet with any success. Hall and Loucks (1981) present a detailed discussion of innovation configurations; the process can be briefly described as follows.

Those who wish to develop Innovation Configurations checklists begin by consulting designers of an innovation. Designers provide detailed descriptions of what the innovation should look like if implemented with fidelity.

The second step is examination of all literature and materials describing the innovation. A list of descriptive phrases is developed based on the information gathered from innovation developers and literature connected with the innovation under study.

A preliminary list of all descriptive elements is sent to individuals purported to be using the innovation. These people may add descriptive phrases if there are elements connected with the innovation that do not appear on the original list. The Innovation Configuration checklist is then filtered back to the developers of the innovation for final reactions, revisions, and comments. The Innovation Configuration checklist, then, becomes a list of

descriptive phrases that outline materials, methods, evaluation techniques, and other characteristics of an innovation in its ideal form.

On the surface, this approach seemed consistent with the concept of structural components we were developing. Yet, a major difference between the concept of Innovation Configurations and the structural components concept was the focus on the individual that characterizes the Concerns-Based Adoption Model. Structural components require looking at an innovation site in its entirety rather than the micro-level examination of individual user implementation. Clearly, Innovation Configurations, as described by Hall & Loucks (1981) gave us a model for the outline-format checklist we wanted, but the focus was too specific for our purposes. (For those interested in applications of the CBAM models, recommended sources are Hall, Hord and Griffin, 1980; Roecks & Andrews, 1980; Hall, 1977; Rutherford, 1978; Rutherford, 1979; Blakely, Mayer, Roitman and Gottschalk, 1983; and Holloway, 1981.)

Colbert (1977) has carried the LoU process in a direction similar to that of structural components with his Levels of Use Observational Inventory (LoUOI). The inventory lists the behaviors a teacher should exhibit if the individual is implementing an innovation. While Colbert's approach is fruitful and represents a further refining of CBAM approaches, the focus remains on the individual. We believe that the individual is more likely to exhibit behaviors associated with an innovation if macro and middle level structures provide a framework that elicits such behaviors.

Thus, one must determine whether such envrionmental factors exist before turning attention to the behaviors of individual innovation users.

Loucks (1977) warns against relying on the word of building administrators to determine that an innovation is truly being implemented. She advocates going directly to the teachers, the users of an intervention, to determine the level of innovation implementation. We advocate this consultation method combined with observation of the individual user, but not until an assessment of structures has taken place. We believe such an assessment should be undertaken as a collective effort by a building's staff members. Thus, responding to the Structural Components Inventory can help a staff determine constraints that building structures place on individuals attempting to implement an innovation.

Owens and Haenn (1977) critique the CBAM because of similar reasons. They say that the model places responsibility for an innovation replication on the user, as if all components of any given innovation were totally and equally acceptable and/or desirable. Owens and Haenn recommend a profile of program components, such as an on-site checklist. They call such an approach an Essential Characteristics Checklist with an accompanying one to five rating scale. We have incorporated some of the ideas espoused by Owens and Haenn, but the Structural Components Inventory uses the categories of "not done," "being developed," and "fully implemented" in place of a one to five scale. While Owens and Haenn use a rating of one to indicate an unacceptable level of

implementation, an inventory item on the SESCI identified as "not done" is considered an unacceptable level of implementation.

Roitman and Mayer (1982) consider five situational parameters that must be considered when planning an innovation or change: (a) the scope of change involved, (b) the certainty of technology or theory, (c) the amount of conflict over policy goals and means, (d) the structure of the institutional setting, and (e) the stability of the environment. Roitman and Mayer present a 5-step model for developing what they call a fidelity instrument. Their approach is sound and it influenced the construction of our structural components inventory.

Gottschalk, Roitman, Emshoff & Blakely (1981) state that "specificity in detailing components or innovation configurations is critical" (p. 15). We have tried to assure such specificity in our inventory. In addition, Gottschalk et al. state that "a hybrid evaluation model that clearly ties specific innovation components and configurations to specific program outcomes is essential for the implementation researcher, innovation developer, program evaluator, program disseminator, and program adapter" (p. 15). We believe we have designed a tool specific enough in nature that it can serve, for those beginning to implement an effective schools project, as a guide to the innovation process. It can be used, also, as a checklist for determining areas that need attention and for determining where strengths lie. Finally it may be used as a summative evaluation tool whenever those in charge of innovation feel the need to have some closure concerning the progress of the

implementation. In these ways we have incorporated a large body of literature into the process of developing our components checklist.

CBAM does deal with the issues of routinization and institutionalization of an innovation. However, because of the scope and complexity of effective schools practice, involving all the staff of a building over an extended time period, it is difficult to get a complete picture of school structure through the individual perspectives of a sample of users. School staff members tend to take some significant structural components for granted once they are in place, and rarely refer to them unless asked. We are interested in determining the organizational structure of schools, the framework within which individuals work, and the degree of coupling that exists, as critical aspects of school effectiveness.

The concept of loosely-coupled schools (Weick, 1976) has been viewed as increasingly important in understanding the dynamics of effective schools. Most schools are cellular in organizational structure. Each classroom (teacher) an autonomous unit with little or no linkage to the next cells. Typical of this notion is the practice of "adding" or "losing" a teacher when enrollment shifts; the loss or addition of the unit has little or no impact on the other classrooms because there is little, if any, formal connection or informal interaction (at least that are task-based).

Recently, however, several researchers have raised the possibility that not all schools are equally coupled or linked. Furthermore, evidence is increasing that organizational and school effectiveness is associated with more tightly linked schools, which

somehow have overcome the cellular isolation, autonomy, and independence that is typical. Rosenholtz (1985) reviews research on teaching related to school effectiveness, finding an association between norms of professional growth and improvement, organizational effectiveness, and an increase in informal task-oriented communication, collective effort, and mutual support among teachers. Firestone and Wilson (1985) suggest strategies for principals to use to improve instruction. These strategies focus on increasing the effectiveness of bureaucratic (formal rules, procedures, schedules, meetings) and cultural (subjective, normative, symbolic beliefs, rituals, and interactions) linkages in the school. Weick (1982) focuses on coupling and strategies for change.

In addition to the conceptual work, several recent studies have addressed the measurement of coupling or linkages within schools. Astuto and Clark (1985) and Miskel, McDonald, and Bloom (1983) found stronger degrees of coupling to be associated with greater school effectiveness. Wilson and Corbett (1983) found greater likelihood of change in schools attempting innovations to be associated with stronger linkages. Moch, Feather, and Fitzgibbons (1983) measured general organizational effectiveness, again positively associated with greater ties and links between organizational subunits and members.

Several promising concepts and techniques are developed in these studies. We acknowledge our debt to these efforts. But the measurement of coupling is still in its infancy and our purpose in measuring structure seems more inclusive than a focus on coupling

per se. In some sense, the entire SESCI is an attempt to assess the organizational structures that comprise the coupling links. Nonetheless, we included a subsection specifically on coupling. We suspect that there are many ways to measure coupling within organizations. We also suspect that there will be discovered several unsuccessful methods before the most productive have been operationalized.

Methods

The SESCI, developed by Miller et al. (1985), serves as a tool for assessing structural elements in a school environment that contribute to effectiveness. The tool provides useful information that supplements what can be learned from the implementation of existing school climate instruments. In addition, the SESCI can serve as a tool to guide planned change efforts and to determine areas where change may be needed. A copy of the instrument appears in Appendix A. Those wishing to learn more about the initial development of the SESCI may refer to Miller et al. (1985).

Subjects

In order to accomplish preliminary validation of the SESCI, we concentrated on elementary schools where we had access to key members of the schools' staffs. We made no attempt to draw a statistically representative sample for this preliminary validation effort. Rather, we administered the instrument to school leadership teams who were willing to participate in the validation effort or who actively sought participation by contacting us. Therefore, the effects of selection on the results of instrument administration

must be considered.

Elementary schools in a large, metropolitan school district served as units of analysis for this study. Several schools from outside the target system, all in fairly well-to-do school districts, also served as units of analysis. We placed schools in one of nine identifying cells determined by achievement, as measured by standardized test results, and overall school socioeconomic status (SES) profile, as determined by the number of students in the school receiving free or reduced meals. Table 1 shows these cells and the number of schools in each cell participating in the preliminary validation of SESCI.

Table 1

Dimensions Used to Place Schools in Cells

Academic Achievement	High (1 sd above mean)	3	1	1
	Medium (± 1 sd around mean)	1	1	1
	Low (1 sd below mean)	1	0	1
		Low (1 sd below mean)	Medium (± 1 sd around mean)	High (1 sd above mean)

Social Composition of the School

Outliers for this study are those schools that fit into the cells labeled: (a) high SES, high achievement; (b) high SES, low achievement; (c) low SES, high achievement; and (d) low SES, low

achievement. We placed schools in these cells following regression analysis; the schools had aggregate, mean achievement scores that were lower or higher than expected after accounting for the independent variables of socioeconomic status, race, advanced program placement, attendance percentages, and size of school, respectively. Of the five variables entered in the regression equation, only two were significant. SES accounted for 68% of the variance in the regression while Advanced Program placement accounted for 8.4%.

We classified schools as positive outliers based on achievement if the school was more than one standard deviation above the mean in reading, in math, or in both reading and math. Similarly, we listed schools as negative outliers if the school was more than one standard deviation below the mean in reading, in math, or in both. Finally, we completed separate regression analyses for reading and math.

The data utilized to determine outliers in this study are available from the school districts under study. A description and an explanation of the operational definitions that were used for the analyses appears below. The data, in addition to those specified above, include separate scores for Reading and Total Math on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills-Form U (CTBS-U) and the Kentucky Essential Skills Test (KEST).

We estimated achievement using standardized test data for third and fifth grade students. We took the mean standard score for each grade, subtracted the mean of the norming sample and divided by the

standard deviation to derive a z-score. We then multiplied mean z-scores for each grade level by the number of students taking a particular test. We summed these numbers across grades and divided the sum by the total number tested. This yielded an estimated mean achievement score for each school. Finally, we determined separate norms for reading and math.

We obtained data for the percent average attendance and percent white for the year by school from district records. A caveat is in order here. Based on demographic studies across the nation, percent white has been shown to have a positive correlation with achievement. There is no suggestion that there is a causal link between race and lower achievement; rather, demographic studies reflect the reality that in America minorities are highly overrepresented among the poor. Yet both high income minorities and low income whites are common. It is generally the case, however, that a positive correlation for percent white holds up, although the suggestion is clear that as better measures of SES are held constant, the effects of race tend to disappear.

We determined a socioeconomic status (SES) factor for each school based on the percent of students receiving free lunches, reduced lunches, and paid lunches. We obtained the number of free and reduced lunches per school from district records. Subtracting the percent free and the percent reduced from 100 percent yielded the percent of paid lunches within a school. The percent of paid lunches includes both those who pay for and those who carry their own lunches. This variable, the best available to us, is actually a

measure of the composition of a school's student body when combined with percent white.

Upon examination of the district guidelines for free or reduced lunch eligibility, we found that there was a ratio of .7 between free and reduced lunches based on the ceilings for income and family size. The SES factor was operationally defined by using the .7 ratio calculated between free and reduced and by projecting a similar ratio between reduced and paid lunches.

We derived an operational definition for school SES from a linear transformation of the lunch data as follows:

school SES = (1.0 x % free) + (1.429 x % reduced) + (2.037 x % paid).

The range for the SES factor is 100 to 203.7 with 100 indicating low SES. This operational definition of SES may be a biased estimate of the actual SES composition of a school. The .7 ratio between reduced and paid was an arbitrary decision and does not adequately represent the range of higher family incomes beyond the projected ratio. Therefore, underestimation may be a greater likelihood in schools with a higher incidence of paid lunches. The greater the levels of income in any community, the greater is the likelihood of an underestimate of school SES at the high end of the scale. However, our familiarity with profiles of individual schools within the district provides face validity for the obtained school SES factor.

We asked specific individuals working in participating schools to take part in the administration of the SESCI. These individuals

made up a group we designated "the school leadership team" which was comprised of both administrators and teachers. Participating teachers were those serving as formal team members and/or informal leaders in the school. The leadership team responded in consensus to the SESCI.

Instrument Administration

Individuals (three) administering the SESCI had training in research methods and administration of survey instruments. Additional training consisted of familiarization with effective schools literature. Researchers had an opportunity to work together on initial administrations of the SESCI in order to strengthen the possibility that these individuals would administer the instrument in similar ways. Finally, researchers followed sets of standardized instructions for administering the SESCI. These instructions appear in Appendix B. In these ways we attempted to address issues of reliability of instrument administration.

Researchers met with members of a school leadership team at the team's school. (Since completion of the inventory required after-school meeting time, individuals were paid to participate in the study.) Each participant received a copy of the SESCI. The group selected one of its members as a recorder; this individual wrote down the group's answer to each of the inventory items. Researchers helped participants interpret inventory items when such help was requested or when conflicting interpretations required such clarification. Researchers also made it clear to participants that they had to respond to the instrument collectively; the group had to

reach consensus before recording a response to any single item. Researchers encouraged and recorded comments made by individuals during the process of reaching the consensus.

Completion of the SESCI took approximately two hours. This time period usually included a brief break. The length of administration may increase when more discussion is needed to achieve consensus.

Analysis of Responses to the SESCI

A major portion of the SESCI consists of 13 structural components or scales. Participants in any one school responded to scale items after reaching consensus on specific items. They indicated the stage of implementation: not done, in development, or complete; they indicated, as well, the structure of implementation: formal or informal. Possible responses, in ascending order from undesirable to ideal, include: (a) not done; (b) in development, informal; (c) in development, formal; (d) complete, informal; (e) in development, informal and formal; (f) complete, formal, and (g) complete, informal and formal.

We assigned a numerical value, from zero to six, to each of these possible responses. In order to obtain a score for any scale, we summed the responses to items making up a scale. A high summed score on a scale indicates a corresponding high degree of implementation of the structures indicated in items making up that scale. The 13 structural components or scales derived from the SESCI are: (a) mission and goals, (b) staff development related to school improvement; (c) inservice on school and teacher effectiveness; (d) the role of the principal, (e) program planning,

(f) curriculum/instruction/testing alignment; (g) time for instruction; (h) safe and orderly environment; (i) procedures for evaluation; (j) curriculum materials file; (k) academic team games; (l) reward structures; and (m) parent/community support and involvement.

Initial analysis of data includes means and standard deviations for each scale by school and by cells as shown in Table 1. We calculated reliability within each scale using a program from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). We further calculated reliability between scales using the same program. We used data from all 12 schools, in aggregate form, to compute reliability coefficients. Results of this preliminary analysis of data gathered using the SESCI follow.

Results

As indicated in Table 1, the leadership teams from 12 schools responded to the SESCI, thereby providing the data for preliminary validation of the instrument. Means for each of the 12 schools across the 13 instrument scales appear in Tables 2-14.

We did not prepare reliability coefficients to determine differences between schools on separate scales. The small number of cases per cell made such analysis inappropriate. We did, however, calculate means for each school on each scale; we calculated cell means in cells containing more than a single school. In addition, we compared schools grouped by achievement level and SES. Using Chi-square analysis, we found no significant correlations between

Table 2

Mission/Goals

Academic Achievement	L	M	H
H	42.0 35.0 17.0 — 31.33	4.0	40.0 38.0 45.0 — 41.0
M	40.0	40.0	40.0
L	44.0		37.0

Social Composition

Table 3

Staff Development for School Improvement

Academic Achievement	L	M	H
H	27.0 21.0 24.0 — 24.0	12.0	15.0 12.0 28.0 — 18.33
M	15.0	33.0	25.0
L	26.0		14.0

Social Composition

Table 4

In-Service on Effective Schools

Academic Achievement	L	M	H
H	54.0 93.0 35.0 — 60.67	0.0	77.0 0.0 29.0 — 35.33
M	16.0	59.0	46.0
L	51.0		28.0

Social Composition

Table 5

Role of Principal

Academic Achievement	L	M	H
H	38.0 33.0 32.0 — 34.33	26.0	44.0 25.0 43.0 — 37.33
M	33.0	53.0	48.0
L	36.0		38.0

Social Composition

Table 6

Program Planning

Academic Achievement	L	M	H
H	51.0 51.0 46.0 — 49.33	31.0	26.0 43.0 50.0 — 39.67
M	42.0	47.0	46.0
L	56.0		51.0

Social Composition

Table 7

Curriculum/Instruction/Testing Alignment

Academic Achievement	L	M	H
H	91.0 95.0 59.0 — 81.67	25.0	92.0 95.0 99.0 — 95.33
M	90.0	99.0	96.0
L	83.0		78.0

Social Composition

Table 8

Time on Task

Academic Achievement	L	M	H
H	50.0 51.0 36.0 — 45.67	37.0	42.0 23.0 47.0 — 37.33
M	50.0	52.0	43.0
L	49.0		50.0

Social Composition

Table 9

Safe and Orderly Environment

Academic Achievement	L	M	H
H	40.0 21.0 16.0 — 25.67	35.0	30.0 40.0 36.0 — 35.33
M	40.0	30.0	46.0
L	44.0		40.0

Social Composition

Table 10

Procedures for Evaluation

Academic Achievement	L	M	H
H	45.0 42.0 32.0 — 39.67	33.0	34.0 56.0 40.0 — 43.33
M	55.0	32.0	40.0
L	37.0		29.0

Social Composition

Table 11

Curriculum Materials Files

Academic Achievement	L	M	H
H	42.0 83.0 25.0 50.0	33.0	34.0 116.0 105.0 85.0
M	55.0	34.0	45.0
L	46.0		47.0

Social Composition

Table 12

Academic Team Games

Academic Achievement	L	M	H
H	0.0 35.0 18.0 17.67	52.0	17.0 66.0 47.0 43.33
M	23.0	20.0	12.0
L	21.0		48.0

Social Composition

Table 13

Procedures for Evaluation

Academic Achievement	L	M	H
H	55.0 38.0 41.0 44.67	16.0	43.0 50.0 34.0 42.33
M	30.0	22.0	44.0
L	36.0		55.0

Social Composition

Table 14

Parent/Community Support and Involvement

Academic Achievement	Social Composition: L	Social Composition: M	Social Composition: H
H	30.0 35.0 30.0 31.67	29.0	28.0 21.0 40.0 29.67
M	27.0	18.0	41.0
L	40.0		22.0

the scales and SES or achievement. The level of significance was greatest for achievement by the scales of Time for Instruction and Safe and Orderly Environment (α = 0.16). However, this Chi-square result was not statistically significant. The level was greatest for SES by the scales of Curriculum Materials Files, Reward Structures and Parent/Community Relations (α = 0.13). Once again, this Chi-square result was not statistically significant.

Table 15 summarizes reliability findings within scales. The first column of the table gives the name of each of the 13 scales. The table lists the number of items comprising each scale and the range of possible responses given the 0-6 designation described above. Further, the table lists the mean, standard deviation and reliability coefficient alpha for each scale collapsed across the 12 participating schools.

Table 15
Summary Data for 12 Schools for Reliability
Analyses Within Scales

Scale	Number of Items	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Alpha
Mission/Goals	8	0-48	34.91	12.72	.933
Staff Development for School Improvement	7	0-42	21.55	7.23	.586
In-Service on Effective Schools	21	0-126	41.10	25.77	.924
Role of Principal	10	0-60	38.55	7.85	.513
Program Planning	11	0-66	47.1	6.84	.478
Curriculum Alignment	21	0-126	81.10	22.9	.919
Time for Instruction	13	0-78	46.89	6.05	-0.363
Safe and Orderly Environment	8	0-48	35.27	9.40	.900
Procedures for Evaluation	15	0-90	39.58	8.80	.648
Curriculum Materials Files	27	0-162	55.42	29.67	.941
Academic Team Games	14	0-84	33.22	21.72	.950
Reward Structures	13	0-78	39.45	12.36	.740
Parent/Community Involvement	10	0-60	30.27	8.03	.385

Of the scales, 6 appear to be reliable ($\alpha \geq .900$). These scales are Mission/Goals, In-service on Effective Schools, Curriculum/Instruction/ Testing Alignment, Safe and Orderly Envrionment, Curriculum Materials Files, and Academic Team Games. Two scales--Time for Instruction ($\alpha = -0.363$) and Parent/Community Involvement ($\alpha = .385$) appear to have little correlation between items in the scale.

A wide variance in responses to items comprising four scales is indicated by standard deviations. The scales exhibiting the widest variance in responses are In-service on Effective Schools (sd = 25.77), Curriculum Alignment (sd = 29.67), Academic Team Games (sd = 21.72), and Curriculum Materials Files (sd = 29.67).

Discussion

The data compiled for this study serve as a preliminary validation effort for the SESCI. Several caveats are in order that may help to make sense of the study's results. First, schools in the high SES, high achievement cell responded to an early form of the SESCI. We transposed the data to the revised form of the SESCI prior to analysis in order to have comparable data from all participating schools. The fact that schools in a key cell responded to an instrument somewhat different from that to which other schools responded may contribute to differences between cells.

A second caveat is related to the method of data collection used in this study. The SESCI relies on self-report, introducing attendant problems such as perceptual versus objective measures of structure, social desirability, and response bias. The data

presented here, then, must be approached with caution because of these difficulties.

With these caveats in mind, an examination of cell means by the 13 scales indicates the following directions. First, means from the various cells on each of the 13 scales vary considerably. No patterns emerge from examination of these means; the variance does not seem to be predictable by SES or achievement. One reason for failure to uncover predictable patterns may be the number of cells containing only one case. The problems inherent in self-report and the impact of social desirability (most schools want to be considered effective) on responses may also be a contributing factor in the lack of predictable variance.

The unrefined quality of certain scales may also contribute to the similarities that exist among cells. Perhaps further refinement of instrument items and administration of the instrument to many more school leadership teams will yield more responsive data.

Chi-square analysis of schools grouped by achievement level and SES yielded no significant correlations. We believe that a valid instrument measuring school structure would yield differences by these two variables. However, two correlations, achievement by Time for Instruction and by Safe and Orderly Environment, are close enough to being statistically significant that refinement of the two scales may be sufficient to achieve significance. The same is true for SES by the scales Curriculum Materials Files, Reward Structures, and Parent/Community Relations.

Two scales need considerable revision in order to improve

reliability within the scale. These scales are Time for Instruction and Parent/ Community Involvement. Some revision is still required if the scales of Program Planning, the Role of the Principal, Staff Development for School Improvement, Procedures for Evaluation, and Reward Structures are to yield acceptable reliability. Given the results of this part of the study, it is evident that the SESCI is promising, but that it requires considerable refining.

Further analysis is necessary to determine the nature of the wide variance noted for the scales of In-service on Effective Schools, Curriculum Alignment, Academic Team Games, and Curriculum Materials Files. Variance in the response means for these scales may indicate scales that effectively measure school differences between cells. On the other hand, wide variance exists among schools within cells on various scales. Needed are more cases in each of the nine cells before any conclusions can be drawn concerning the ability of the instrument to measure structural differences between low and high achieving schools with varied social compositions.

Comments from participants in the study suggest several directions the refinement of SESCI can take. For example, the term "depend on" occurs in several items on the instrument. Participants demonstrated considerable discomfort with the terminology, suggesting that items including this phrase may need revision.

Participants reacted negatively to the length of the instrument. Perhaps in revising some of the scales, items can be eliminated that do not correlate well with other items in a

particular scale. Such revision can serve two purposes, refining a scale and shortening the instrument. On the other hand, we are aware that reliability in the traditional sense may not be entirely appropriate for an instrument such as this. A low alpha reliability score within a scale may simply reflect the reality that schools have not dealt consistently with various aspects of the structure of a given topic. The bias in traditional psychometric statistics toward an underlying stable trait (see Besag, 1981) may be particularly troublesome in attempts to measure structure.

What can be said about the SESCI? Clearly, in its present form, the instrument does not do what it was intended to do, i.e., distinguish structural patterns that differ by social composition/SES or by achievement. But much work remains to be done. Demographic and background information at the beginning of the instrument are yet to be analyzed, including the amount and make-up of in-service on school improvement/effectiveness and the section on coupling. The coupling questions hold promise, but in their present form are unlikely to be sensitive to any differences between schools because the statements do not clearly indicate whether the response is to be for a given teacher or for all faculty.

Our observations while administering the instrument have provided considerable insight into the scales that were least clear to the respondents. The appropriate level of response for the coupling section is only one example. Revisions of the various scales are obviously needed if the inventory is to be a useful tool for assessing the structure of effectiveness. But the amount of

revision needed for this particular instrument is not unrelated to several issues relevant to the measure of structure.

First, the results presented here do not address the further problem of structural variation among schools at the secondary level. Obviously more research is needed here. Second, school effectiveness researchers are beginning to find that high and low income effective schools are not identical. This suggests structural differences that do exist. If this instrument is not sensitive to those differences, the further conclusion that no structural differences exist is clearly not warranted. Furthermore, the research on coupling reviewed earlier also suggests real structural differences among schools. The implication is strong that the search for better ways to measure the structure of school effectiveness needs to continue.

Third, most of the schools in our sample came from the same urban district. Lack of structural variation in our sample of schools may be related to the similar effects of district policy on the structure of curriculum, testing, data usage, discipline policies, etc., within the schools in that district. Further research on differences in the structure of school effectiveness at the district level may prove to be a useful direction.

Fourth, the SESCI is useful in its present form even if it does not work psychometrically. The process of self-assessment by the leadership team, over a detailed listing of structures that are framed within the school effectiveness research, proved to be useful to the schools participating in this study. The results of the

self-assessment can be utilized for programmatic planning for school improvement and provide rich data to supplement the information normally available to schools.

Finally, we remain undaunted. Work in the areas of school improvement, innovation, and change, as well as the coupling and social composition research in the school effectiveness tradition, all indicate that structure is important. Hopefully, the findings from unsuccessful efforts can provide clues to a better understanding of the structure and dynamics of effective schools in the future.

REFERENCES

Anderson, L. W. (1981). Instruction and time-on-task: A review. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 13, 289-303.

Astuto, T. A., & Clark, D. L. (1985). Strength of organizational coupling in the instructionally effective school. Urban Education, 19, 331-356.

Besag, F. P. (1981). Social Darwinism, race, and research. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 3(1), 55-69.

Blakely, C., Mayer, J., Roitman, D. & Gottschalk, R. (1983). The implementation of disseminated educational innovations: Is the modified RD&D model viable? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Associaiton, Montreal, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 235 177)

Brookover, W. B., Beamer, L., Efthim, H., Hathaway, D., Lezotte, L., Miller, S., Passalacqua, J., & Tornatzky, L. (1982). Creating effective schools: An inservice program for enhancing school learning climate and achievement. Holmes Beach, Fla.: Learning Publications, Inc.

Clark, D. L., Lotto, L. S., & Astuto, T. A. (1984). Effective schools and school improvement: A comparative analysis of two lines of inquiry. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(3), 41-68.

Colbert, J. A. (1977). The development and implementation of the Levels of Use Observational Inventory (LoUOI): An instrument ot aid in the adoption of an innovation process. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Cincinnati, Ohio. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 636)

Firestone, W. A., & Wilson, B. L. (1985). Using bureaucratic and cultural linkages to improve instruction: The principal's contribution. Educational Administraiton Quarterly, 21(2), 7-30.

Gottschalk, R., Roitman, D., Emshoff, J., & Blakely, C. (1981, October). Multi-site implementation and replication of research findings: Is the modified RD&D model viable? Paper presented at a meeting of the Evaluation Research Society, Austin, Texas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 798)

Guzzetti, B. J. (1985, April). A critical examination of instruments measuring school effectiveness characteristics. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago.

Hall, G. E. (1974). The Concerns-based Adoption Model: A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 111 791)

Hall, G. E. (1977, April). A longitudinal investigation of individual implementation of educational innovations. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 140 507)

Hall, G. E., & Loucks, S. F. (1977). A developmental model for determining whether the treatment is actually impelemented. American Educational Research Journal, 14(3), 263-276.

Hall, G. E., & Loucks, S. F. (1981, April). The concept of innovation configurations: An approach to addressing program adaptation. Research on concerns-based adoption. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 454)

Hall, G. E., Loucks, S. F., Rutherford, W. L. & Newlove, B. W., (1975, Spring). Levels of use of the innovation: A framework for analyzing innovation adoption. Journal of Teacher Education, XXVI(1), 52-56.

Hall, G., Houd, S. M., and Griffin, T. H. (1980). Implementation at the school building level: The development and analysis of nine mini-case studies. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 170)

Holloway, R. E. (1981, February). A methodology for assessing the implementation of educational innovations: Analysis and revision. Final report. New York: Columbia University, New York Teacher's College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 202 866)

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1984). Innovation up close: How school improvement works. New York: Plenum Press.

Loucks, S. F. (1977, April). Levels of use of the innovation: The conceptualization of measurement of a variable useful for assessing innovation implementation by individuals. Paper presented by the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 137 947)

Loucks, S. F., Newlove, B. W., & Hall, G. E. (1975). Measuring Levels of Use of the Innovation: A Manual for Trainers, Interviewers, and Raters. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas.

Marks, R. (1980). Legitimating industrial capitalism: Philanthropy and individual differences. In R. F. Arnove (Ed.), Philanthropy and cultural imperialism: The foundations at home and abroad (pp. 87-122). Boston: G. K. Hall & Co.

Miller, S. K. (1985). Research on exemplary schools: An historical perspective. In G. R. Austin & H. Garber (Eds.), Research on exemplary schools (pp. 3-30). Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press.

Miller, S. K., & Brookover, W. B. (1985, April). School effectiveness versus individual differences: Paradigmatic perspectives on the legitimation of economic and educational inequalities. Paper being prepared for American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco.

Miller, S. K., Efthim, H., Koppel, S., & Sayre, K. A. (1985, April). Measuring school improvement implementation: A School Effectiveness Structural Components Inventory. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago.

Miller, S. K., Sayre, K. A., & Tinsley, D. S. (1984). Effective schools and educational change: Implications for teacher educators. The Teacher Educator, 19(4), 2-13.

Miskel, C., McDonald, D., & Bloom, S. (1983). Structural and expectancy linkages within schools and organizational effectiveness. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19(1), 49-82.

Moch, M., Feather, J. N., & Fitzgibbons, D. (1983). Conceptualizing and measuring the relational structure in organizations. In S. E. Seashore, E. E. Lawler III, P. H. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.), Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices (pp. 203-228). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Owens, T. R. & Haenn, J. F. (1977). Assessing the level of implementation of new programs. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 136 426)

Pink, W. (1984). Creating effective schools. The Educational Forum, 49(1), 91-107.

Roecks, A. L., & Andrews, J. H. (1980, April). Levels of Use interviews: A successful formative evaluation tool [Revised]. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 251)

Roitman, D. P., & Mayer, J. P. (1982, August). Fidelity and reinvention in the implementation of innovations. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 225 058)

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1985). Effective schools: Interpreting the evidence. American Journal of Education, 93, 352-388.

Rutherford, W. L. (1978, March). The personal interview: A tool for investigating and understanding change in schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 173)

Rutherford, W. L. (1979). Examination of the implementation of a junior high school's new approach to discipline by longitudinal analysis of change in teachers' Stages of Concern and Levels of Use. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 171)

Sarason, S. B. (1971). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Paradigms and research programs in the study of a teaching: A contempory perspective. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (third edition, pp. 3-36). New York: Macmillan.

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, x. (1986). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.

Weick, K. E. (1982). Management of organizational change among loosely coupled elements. In P. S. Goodman & Associates, Change in organizations: New perspectives on theory, research, and practice (pp. 375-408). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, B. L., & Corbett, H. D. (1983). Organization and change: The effects of school linkages on the quantity of implementation. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19(4), 85-104.

SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS INVENTORY

developed by

Stephen K. Miller
University of Louisville

Helen Efthim
Pontiac (Mich.) Public Schools

Sheree P. Koppel
University of Louisville/Mercy Academy

Kathleen A. Sayre
University of Louisville/
Jefferson County (KY) Public Schools

Information for the Respondent

1. Research on the characteristics of effective schools is often categorized in three dimensions: the culture, ideology, or climate of the school; the organizational structure of the school; and the individual instructional behaviors and practices of teachers. This instrument addresses only the structural dimension. The questions and responses are designed to measure both the degree of organizational coupling and the degree to which the policies and regularities of the school are consistent with the ideal effective school structure.
2. This inventory is designed to be filled out by "people in the know" in a school. Typically this may include the principal, members of the leadership team, and/or supervisory personnel from the district office. We recommend that a team of 3-7 persons work through the inventory, assessing the status of each component as a group. This process will force consensus on each item; perhaps more important, this team approach provides the basis of shared problem assessment and subsequent decision making in any school improvement effort based on this and other need

assessment surveys. For schools with a large Building Leadership Team, the format suggested here may require a sub-committee to complete the survey itself.

3. The number of structural components in a school is large. A comprehensive inventory is necessarily detailed. Those who use this inventory should plan to invest considerable effort on the task. Paid inservice or meeting time may be an appropriate format, allowing about two hours.
4. The results of the inventory can be used in three distinct ways: (1) The inventory provides an estimate of the completeness of the structural components necessary for a school effectiveness program at a point in time; (2) The inventory can be used to measure changes in the structure over time; (3) The completed inventory can be utilized as a guide to specific steps that a given school should take to put in place the requisite structures for a successful school improvement program.
5. This inventory focuses on the existing structures in a school. Yet school improvement occurs over time. The structures of school improvement and effectiveness tend to accumulate as a staff institutes new practices and develops supporting policies and procedures. By reporting on the current status of the school, these cumulative changes should be reflected. Likewise, practices and structures may decay or deteriorate over time; the current focus of the instrument should reflect that structures and practices which once were are no more. In a couple of instances (noted specifically for those questions) information is requested on activities over the last three years. Unless otherwise indicated, however, respondents should indicate the current status of the school.

SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS INVENTORY

DIRECTIONS: Check the appropriate responses to each of the questions below.

1. This school is:
   _____ A. private
   _____ B. public
   _____ C. parochial

2. The type of community where this school is located is:
   _____ A. Inner-city
   _____ B. Urban fringe
   _____ C. Suburban
   _____ D. Small town
   _____ E. Rural
   _____ F. State where this school is located _____

3. The percent of students in this school that are eligible for free/reduced lunch is:
   _____ 0 - 19%
   _____ 20 - 39%
   _____ 40 - 59%
   _____ 60 - 79%
   _____ 80 - 100%

4. The percent of students in this school who are white is:
   _____ 0 - 19%
   _____ 20 - 39%
   _____ 40 - 59%
   _____ 60 - 79%
   _____ 80 - 100%

5. Has this school formally initiated a school effectiveness/school improvement program? ____Yes ____No If yes, during what school year was this program begun?_____

6. The level of this school is:

_____ elementary
_____ middle/jr. high
_____ secondary
_____ mixed levels

7. The number of students attending this school is:

_____ below 300
_____ 300 - 499
_____ 500 - 999
_____ 1,000 - 1,999
_____ 2,000 or more

8. A leadership team for the purpose of guiding school improvement efforts has been organized in this school:

_____ yes
_____ no

9. The leadership team has representatives from which of the following areas? (Check all that apply.)

_____ district supervisory personnel
_____ outside consultant
_____ principal
_____ other administrators
_____ counselors
_____ grade group or department chairpersons
_____ classroom teachers
_____ compensatory/special education teachers
_____ special area teachers (music, art, PE)
_____ students
_____ parent/community representatives
_____ representatives of the business community
_____ informal faculty leaders

10. If your school has become involved in a school improvement program, was that the result of:

_____ an administrative mandate

_____ a decision made by a leadership team or some other segment of the staff

_____ a consensus (or nearly so) decision made by the school staff as a whole

11. In this school, student assignment to classrooms has been accomplished on the basis of

_____ random placement, forming heterogeneous groups

_____ skill/ability levels, forming homogeneous groups

12. In this school, student assignment to instructional groups within classrooms has been accomplished using: (Check all that apply)

_____ whole class instruction

_____ flexible and temporary group-based instruction based on need for specific skill objectives

_____ group instruction with stable skill level groups based on functional performance

_____ group instruction with heterogeneous levels

_____ individualized instruction

13. Student assignment to instructional levels in reading has been accomplished using

_____ whole group instruction

_____ flexible and temporary group-based instruction based on need for specific skill objectives

_____ group instruction with stable skill level groups based on functional performance

_____ group instruction with heterogeneous levels

_____ individualized instruction

14. Of the following factors, indicate those on which teacher's assignment of students has been based. (Check all that apply)

_____ ability
_____ race
_____ sex
_____ socioeconomic status
_____ behavior
_____ randomization

The following questions refer to the types and numbers of meetings held throughout the year.

15. Meetings of school personnel have been organized on the basis of which of the following: (Check all that apply.)

_____ entire faculty
_____ leadership team only
_____ pairing of teachers
_____ grade level/departmental/team groups
_____ 1 to 1 conferencing
_____ informal discussion

16. Indicate how often the following types of meetings take place in your school.

	never	weekly	biweekly	monthly	bimonthly	once a semester	yearly
entire faculty							
leadership team only							
pairing of teachers							
grade level groups							
principal-teacher conference							
informal discussion							

17. Meetings of school personnel have been concerned primarily with

_____ academic issues
_____ non-academic issues
_____ mixture of academic and non-academic issues

18. Meetings of school personnel have been concerned primarily with

_____ collective issues
_____ individual issues
_____ the adoption of a school improvement program

19. The amount of inservice concerned with the philosophy and practices of effective schools/school improvement that has been of ered yearly is

This Year	Last Year
_____ 3-6 hours (one day)	_____ 3-6 hours (one day)
_____ 7-18 hours (two-three days)	_____ 7-18 hours (two-three days)
_____ four-five days	_____ four-five days
_____ more than one week	_____ more than one week
_____ none	_____ none

Two Years Ago

_____ 3-6 hours (one day)
_____ 7-18 hours (two-three days)
_____ four-five days
_____ more than one week
_____ none

20. Indicate the level of participation of the building staff in the inservice schedule noted for your school in #19 above.

_____ virtually complete (90% or more)
_____ substantial (60-89%)
_____ partial (30-59%)
_____ individual choice (less than 30%)

21. Indicate the mode of attendance which best describes your staff's participation in the inservice schedule noted in #19.

_____ staff participated as a collective group
_____ groups of staff members participated together
_____ staff members participated individually

Directions: For the following statements, indicate the degree of faculty/staff interaction and joint task accomplishment that generally characterizes your school.	Not at all (never)	1 or 2 times per year	Quarterly	Monthly	Biweekly	2 or 3 times per week	Daily
22. Teachers provide and utilize the assistance of other teachers regarding instructional matters.							
23. Teachers give and seek the advice of other teachers on how to increase student achievement.							
24. Teachers depend on other faculty for producing and refining instructional materials.							
25. Teachers jointly plan instructional activities and lessons.							
26. Teachers jointly schedule inter-class instructional activities and academic events.							
27. Teachers jointly schedule a calendar of objectives for instruction of basic skills.							
28. Teachers depend on other faculty for help in instructing all students successfully.							
29. Teachers depend on other faculty for ideas and encouragement to develop and grow professionally.							
30. Regular teachers and compensatory education teachers interact for the purpose of coordinating the progress of compensatory education students.							
31. Regular teachers and special education teachers interact for the purpose of coordinating the progress of mainstreamed special education students.							

	Not at all (never)	1 or 2 times per year	Quarterly	Monthly	Biweekly	2 or 3 times per week	Daily
32. Teachers observe other faculty teaching in your school.							
33. Teachers observe other faculty teaching in other schools.							
34. Teachers and administrators interact informally regarding instructional matters.							
35. Teachers and administrators interact informally regarding the progress of students' learning.							
36. Teachers depend on administrators for assistance in instructional matters.							

The remainder of this inventory utilizes a common format. Respondents will assess the extent to which a given structural component exists in their school along each of two separate dimensions: 1) state of completion, 2) formal-informal structure. A more complete definition of each of the five categories--three for the first dimension and two for the second dimension--is given below.

1.1 NOT DONE: The component is not present or does not exist in this school.

1.2 PRELIMINARY OR DEVELOPMENTAL FORM: The component is in the process of being developed. Supportive mechanisms, inservice programs, and/or skill-based interaction/instruction have not yet reached completed stage.

1.3 COMPLETE AND INTENDED FORM: The component has reached its completed form. Supportive mechanisms are in place and operating efficiently. Inservice has been finished and staff is utilizing the component relatively consistent with patterns/skills intended by the developer.

2.1 EXISTS THROUGH INFORMAL NETWORKS: The component is used by implicit approval and agreement by the faculty or sub-groups of staff. In some cases, the component represents a pattern of use or routine that is regularized among the faculty or sub-groupings. Norms of use have developed among the faculty or sub-groups based on shared values, attitudes, and practices.

2.2 EXISTS THROUGH FORMAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: The component is formally codified through rules, regulations, and guidelines that carry the sanction of the organization. These formal structures may vary from job descriptions to schedules to mandated practices to procedures for monitoring and enforcement.

The three levels of the first dimension, state of completion, are mutually exclusive as defined here. However, the second dimension, formal-informal structure, can and often does exist simultaneously in both forms within a given organization. Thus if a particular component is assessed to be in either "preliminary or developmental form" or "complete and intended form," it could very well be in either one, or both, of the formal-informal categories. (It is assumed that if "Not Done" is checked that no other categories will be checked for that component.) Note that a double line is drawn between the two dimensions.

Directions: Check the columns to the right which indicate the extent to which each of the following components is present in your school. Check all that apply.

	Not Done	Preliminary or developmental form	Complete and intended form	Exists through informal networks	Exists through formal policies and procedures
MISSION/GOAL STATEMENTS HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED.					
School-wide goals have been established.					
School-wide goals have been prioritized.					
School-wide consensus on goals has been reached.					
School-wide goals are communicated to staff.					
School-wide goals are communicated to students.					
School-wide standards and expectations for goal related outcomes have been established.					
Mastery of grade level skills has been established as a goal.					
Mastery of instructional objectives by all students is the first priority goal.					
STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED.					
Inservice at our school has been school-based.					
Frequent meetings of teachers have taken place for the purpose of discussing academic topics.					
The faculty as a whole has been involved in the school effectiveness program.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete		Informal	Formal
People in the building have discussed the effective schools philosophy.						
Reading materials focusing on effective schools have been assigned as part of staff development activities.						
Key knowledgeable people in the program have been accessible to individuals seeking them for guidance.						
Inservice on effective schools has been organized with a long-range focus of more than a single year.						
STAFF HAS PARTICIPATED IN INSERVICE ON SCHOOL AND TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS (DURING LAST 3 YEARS).						
Staff has participated in inservice on goal consensus/academic emphasis.						
Staff has participated in inservice on teacher expectations and student achievement.						
Staff has participated in inservice on instructional leadership/collegial involvement.						
Staff has participated in inservice on grouping policies and practices.						
Staff has participated in inservice on strategies to address problems related to students receiving instruction at both functional and grade levels.						

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
Staff has participated in inservice on strategies to help low-functioning students gain more than a year's academic growth during an instructional year.					
Staff has participated in inservice on mastery learning/direct instruction.					
Staff has participated in inservice on increasing student motivation.					
Staff has participated in inservice on time on task.					
Staff has participated in inservice on school-wide discipline plans.					
Staff has participated in inservice on classroom discipline plans.					
Staff has participated in inservice on classroom management and organizational skills.					
Staff has participated in inservice on academic team games/cooperative learning.					
Staff has participated in inservice on reward incentives/reinforcement.					
Staff has participated in inservice on use of test data for program evaluation.					
Staff has participated in inservice on use of test data to monitor student progress.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
Staff has participated in inservice on developing student test taking skills.					
Staff has participated in inservice on parent/community support and involvement.					
Staff has participated in inservice on processes of change.					
Staff has participated in inservice on characteristics of schools as social organizations.					
Staff has participated in inservice on characteristics of groups and group dynamics.					
THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL/DESIGNATE WITH RESPECT TO EMPHASIS ON OVERALL SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL OUTCOMES HAS BEEN EXAMINED.					
The principal participates regularly in grade level/department meetings.					
The principal participates regularly in curriculum/instructional meetings.					
The principal regularly conducts scheduled classroom observations.					
The principal regularly conducts brief and random classroom visits.					
The principal conducts frequent follow-up conferences to classroom observations that focus on instructional improvement.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
The principal regularly participates in leadership team meetings regarding school improvement.					
The principal establishes procedures that involve faculty and staff members in decision-making processes.					
The principal has established procedures to monitor the effectiveness of policies and practices related to student outcomes.					
The principal has established procedures to monitor follow-through on school effectiveness/school improvement practices.					
The principal consistently enforces and follows through on policies and practices related to school effectiveness/school-staff compliance with improvement.					
POLICIES REGARDING PROGRAMMATIC PLANNING AND COORDINATION HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED.					
A school achievement plan to reflect statement of purpose and beliefs/goals has been developed.					
Procedures to maximize instructional time have been established.					
Instructional objectives for compensatory education students have been established.					
Instructional objectives for mainstreamed special education students have been established.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete		Informal	Formal
Instructional objectives for compensatory education students have been coordinated with the regular curriculum.						
Instructional objectives for mainstreamed special education students have been coordinated with the regular curriculum.						
Homework policies that are consistent with school improvement goals have been established.						
Policies that are consistent with school improvement goals have been established for determining which students must repeat grades.						
A plan has been designed specifically to enable low-functioning students to catch up to grade level by gaining more than one year's academic growth during a school year.						
Policies that involve students actively in decision-making have been established.						
Practices concerning classroom and hallway decor have been examined to ensure that displays are consistent with school improvement goals and efforts.						
CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION/TESTING ALIGNMENT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED.						
Instructional objectives have been established by grade level for basic skills subjects.						

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
Instructional materials have been developed for the skills objectives.					
District- or state-developed basic skills objective referenced tests have been utilized for skills objectives.					
Teacher-made and textbook-developed diagnostic tests have been utilized for skills objectives.					
Pre-requisite skills have been listed sequentially for each instructional objective (task analysis).					
Remedial instructional materials have been developed for basic skills objectives.					
Supplementary enrichment materials have been developed for basic skills objectives.					
Instructional objectives for basic skill areas have been sequenced by level of difficulty.					
A management system for recording student progress through the sequence of instructional objectives has been established.					
A common schedule for teaching grade-level objectives within a school has been established.					
Academic team competitions have been coordinated with a common schedule for teaching grade-level objectives.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
All regular program students have been taught grade-level objectives at grade level.					
All regular program students are expected to master grade-level objectives at grade level.					
Diagnostic testing has been employed to aid in student placements.					
Procedures for testing students have been examined to ensure that students receive instruction at both functional and grade levels.					
Procedures for assigning students to classrooms and instructional groups have been examined to ensure that students receive instruction at both functional and grade levels.					
Procedures and practices for instructing students within different groups have been examined to ensure that students receive instruction at both functional and grade levels.					
Guidelines for progressing through a structured sequence of skills objectives/ textbook levels have been examined to ensure that students receive instruction at both functional and grade levels.					
A program to develop students' test taking skills has been established.					
Strategies for motivating students to do their best on tests have been developed.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
Procedures for implementing pep assemblies prior to major testing have been established.					
POLICIES/PROCEDURES REGARDING TIME FOR INSTRUCTION HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED.					
A school committee to address improved time on task at the school level has been formed.					
A school committee to address improved time on task at the classroom level has been formed.					
Policies have been established to ensure that participation in compensatory education programs does not result in loss of instructional time in the regular academic program.					
Policies have been established to ensure that participation in special education programs does not result in loss of instructional time in the regular academic program.					
Policies governing the conduct of compensatory education require that students be pulled out of the regular classroom in order to participate.					
Policies governing the conduct of compensatory education require that teachers in such programs teach students within the regular classroom.					
Policies have been established to ensure that the building schedule of allocated instructional time is maximized.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
Policies have been established regarding more efficient use of classroom time.					
Policies have been established regarding more efficient use of time for attendance, lunch count, etc.					
Policies have been established regarding loss of instructional time due to changing classes, restroom breaks, etc.					
Policies have been established regarding loss of instructional time due to non-academic activities and events.					
Policies have been established regarding secretary/clerical staff to ensure that practices facilitate instructional time on task and overall school improvement efforts.					
Policies have been established regarding custodial staff to ensure that practices facilitate instructional time on task and overall school improvement efforts.					
POLICIES ENSURING A SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED.					
A school-wide discipline plan has been adopted.					
Classroom discipline plans have been adopted.					
Individual classroom plans have been coordinated with school-wide discipline plans.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete		Informal	Formal
Discipline plans have been developed to include positive reinforcement of appropriate student behavior.						
The school discipline plan has been communicated to students and parents.						
Classroom discipline plans have been communicated to students and parents.						
Procedures for monitoring discipline plans have been established.						
Procedures for enforcing discipline plans have been established.						
PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED						
Procedures have been established for utilizing outcome measures from various sources to guide long range goal setting.						
Procedures have been established for utilizing outcome measures from various sources to guide program evaluation.						
A file of baseline data has been established for use in short and long term program evaluation.						
Staff meetings have been scheduled regularly for the analysis of achievement and other outcome measures.						

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
Data have been analyzed comparing student performance across stanine scores/quartiles.					
Data have been analyzed comparing student performance across racial/ethnic categories.					
Data have been analyzed comparing student performance across socioeconomic indicators such as free or reduced lunch, zip codes, parents' education, parents' occupation.					
Data have been analyzed comparing student performance across students who have repeated a grade.					
A policy has been established that reflects the relationship among achievement standards, grade inflation, and teacher expectations.					
Individualized student achievement results have been communicated clearly and completely to parents.					
Student achievement averages for each school have been communicated to parents and community.					
The variance or distribution of student achievement across stanines/quartiles within schools has been communicated to parents and community.					
A comparison of student scores to national norms has been communicated to parents and community.					
Results of analysis of test data comparing various demographic groups have been communicated to parents and community.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
Outlier data (schools' actual achievement performance compared to expected achievement, based on socio-economic levels of students) have been communicated to parents and community.					
FILE LOCATION FOR CURRICULUM/TESTING MATERIALS (BASIC SKILLS) HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED					
A file of materials has been created for basic skills objectives in language arts.					
A file of materials has been created for the basic skills objectives in mathematics.					
A file of materials has been created for the basic skills objectives in other academic areas.					
Instructional materials files have been created for each grade level (elementary) or course (secondary).					
Files have been created that include strategies for initial content presentation.					
Files have been created that include homework assignments.					
Files have been created that include diagnostic/prescriptive tests.					
Files have been created that include final or summative tests.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
Files have been created that include teacher-made tests.					
Files have been created that include district/state-developed tests.					
Files have been created that include textbook-prepared tests.					
Files have been created that include remedial/ corrective instructional materials.					
Files have been created that include enrichment/ extension instructional materials.					
Files have been created that include instructional materials geared to different learning modalities.					
Files have been created that include instructional strategies for using academic team games/contests.					
Files have been created that include copies of actual basic skills objectives.					
Files have been created that include sequenced lists of basic skills objectives by level of difficulty.					
Files have been created that include prerequisite skills listed sequentially for each instructional objective (task analysis).					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
Files have been created that include common grade level schedules for instruction of the basic skills (objective of the week).					
Policies have been established regarding ease of access to the file.					
Policies have been established regarding the location of the file (centralization versus grade level or departmental based).					
Policies have been established regarding the designation of person(s) responsible for maintaining order, completeness, and integrity of the file materials.					
Policies have been established regarding procedures for teachers and curriculum supervisors to create the various file materials.					
Policies have been established regarding procedures for adding to the existing file materials.					
Policies have been established regarding strategies for obtaining cooperative use and sharing of teacher-contributed materials for the central file.					
Policies have been established regarding procedures for use of file materials in the instructional program.					
Policies have been established regarding procedures for use of file materials as a supplement to instruction in the regular program.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
ACADEMIC TEAM GAMES/COOPERATIVE LEARNING PRACTICES HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED.					
Academically oriented special events that provide a sense of anticipation and challenge have been planned throughout the year.					
Group-based academic games have been utilized within individual classrooms.					
Group-based academic games have been utilized between classrooms.					
Group-based academic games have been utilized by grade-level or departments.					
Academic games have been utilized in language arts.					
Academic games have been utilized in math.					
Academic games have been utilized in other content areas.					
Same-grade peer tutoring has been utilized.					
Cross-age peer tutoring has been utilized.					
Heterogeneous grouping has been utilized as the basis for formation of student teams for academic games.					
Procedures for selection of student teams (self versus teacher selected) have been established for academic games.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
Procedures have been developed establishing regular practice times for academic teams.					
Competition has been developed on an individual basis.					
Competition has been developed on a group basis.					
REWARD STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED WITH RESPECT TO POSITIVE INCENTIVES AND NEGATIVE SANCTIONS.					
Procedures for praise and rewards for teachers have been established.					
Procedures for praise and rewards for students have been established.					
Procedures for praise and rewards for principals have been established.					
School-wide incentive programs have been implemented to reward behavior.					
School-wide incentive programs have been implemented to reward academics.					
School-wide incentive programs have been implemented to reward attendance.					
Grade-level/department level incentive programs have been implemented to reward behavior.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete	Informal	Formal
Grade-level/department level incentive programs have been implemented to reward academics.					
Grade-level/department level incentive programs have been implemented to reward attendance.					
Students have been rewarded for successful competition in academic team games.					
Strategies have been implemented to encourage students to provide recognition to one another for academic performance.					
Standards have been established to discourage teachers' negative comments and expectations concerning students.					
Sanctions have been utilized to discourage teachers' negative comments and expectations concerning students.					
POLICIES AND STRATEGIES TO INCREASE PARENT/COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND INVOLVEMENT HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED. Policies on grading have been communicated to parents.					
Policies on parent-teacher conferences have been communicated to parents.					
Information has been communicated to parents concerning middle and high school students' course selection planning as it relates to college/career decisions.					

	Not Done	Developmental	Complete		Informal	Formal
Specific programs related to school improvement goals have been developed to involve parent volunteers in the school (e.g., calling parents of absent students, tutoring, providing clerical assistance with instructional materials, etc.).						
A program to encourage parents to restrict TV and provide a quiet time for homework each evening has been initiated.						
A campaign to encourage all parents to talk daily with their children about school events and ensure that homework is completed has been initiated.						
A program to increase parent support and cooperation for better attendance has been implemented.						
Publicity directed to parents to encourage an early-to-bed, good-breakfast campaign for students has been initiated.						
A grandparent/retired persons tutoring/volunteer program in the school has been established.						
Churches, community centers, and civic organizations have been involved in setting up tutoring/homework assistance programs.						